IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

DEPARTMENT 63

HON. JOSEPH ZIMMERMAN

CITY OF SAN DIEGO,

PETITIONER,

VS.

SAN DIEGO CITY EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM, ET AL.,

RESPONDENT.

) CASE NO.) 37-2010-00091207-CU-) WM-CTL

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT
FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2014

APPEARANCES ON NEXT PAGE

LOIS MASON THOMPSON, CSR, RPR, CRR
CSR NO. 3685
LOIS.MASON51@GMAIL.COM
760.855.9689

APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)

FOR THE PLAINTIFF CITY OF SAN DIEGO:

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
BY: JAN I. GOLDSMITH, CITY ATTORNEY
DONALD WORLEY, DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
WALTER C. CHUNG, DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
M. TRAVIS PHELPS, DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
1200 THIRD AVENUE
SUITE 1620
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101
619.236.6220

FOR SAN DIEGO CITY EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM:

PAUL HASTINGS LLP BY: CHRISTOPHER H. MCGRATH 4747 EXECUTIVE DRIVE TWELFTH FLOOR SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92121 858.458.3027

FOR THE SAN DIEGO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION:

SMITH, STEINER, VANDERPOOL & WAX BY: ANN M. SMITH 401 WEST A STREET SUITE 320 SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101 619.239.7200

FOR SAN DIEGO CITY FIREFIGHTERS:

GLASER WEIL BY: JOEL N. KLEVENS 10250 CONSTELLATION BOULEVARD 19TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067 310.556.7832 FOR AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES 127:

ROTHNER, SEGALL & GREENSTONE BY: ELLEN GREENSTONE 510 SOUTH MARENGO AVENUE PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91101 626.796.7555

FOR THE SAN DIEGO POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION:

LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL CONGER BY: MICHAEL CONGER 16236 SAN DIEGUITO ROAD SUITE 4-14 RANCHO SANTA FE, CALIFORNIA 92067 858.759.0200

San Diego, California, Friday, February 21, 2014 1 ---0000---2 THE COURT: All right. Good morning, ladies 3 4 and gentlemen. 5 We'll take up the case of the City of San Diego 6 versus San Diego City Employees Retirement System and the 7 related intervenors. 8 Counsel, could you please give your appearances 9 for the record. 10 MR. GOLDSMITH: Jan Goldsmith for the City of 11 San Diego. 12 THE COURT: Good morning. 13 MR. WORLEY: Donald Worley, the City of 14 San Diego. 15 THE COURT: Good morning. 16 MR. CHUNG: Walter Chung on behalf of the City. 17 THE COURT: Good morning. 18 MR. PHELPS: Deputy City Attorney Travis Phelps 19 on behalf of the City. 20 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Good morning. 21 MS. SMITH: Good morning, Your Honor. 22 Ann Smith on behalf of the San Diego Municipal Employees 2.3 Association. 24 THE COURT: Good morning. 25 MS. GREENSTONE: Good morning, Your Honor. 26 Ellen Greenstone on behalf of AFSCME Local 127, 27 Intervenor. 2.8 THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. CONGER: Michael Conger on behalf of the 1 2 San Diego Police Officers Association. 3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. MR. KLEVENS: Good morning, Your Honor. 4 5 Joel Klevens for Intervenor San Diego City Firefighters. 6 THE COURT: I knew there was others. 7 MR. MCGRATH: And Chris McGrath for Respondent 8 San Diego City Employees Retirement System, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 9 10 Have a seat, counsel. 11 Have you all received the tentative decision? 12 (Affirmative response from all counsel in 13 unison.) 14 THE COURT: All right. This is the City's 15 Who wants to argue it for the City? motion. 16 MR. GOLDSMITH: Thank you, Your Honor. 17 Jan Goldsmith for the City of San Diego. 18 I am not going to argue the merits of the 19 motion because we will submit on the tentative and ask 20 that it be confirmed as the ruling of the Court. 21 There is one comment that I would like to make 22 for the future record, given the City of San Diego's 2.3 history, what I am concerned about and why I asked for 24 this hearing. The City of San Diego has a history of 25 agreements that later on when circumstances change are 26 challenged and allegations are made and there's

28 THE COURT: Yeah.

conspiracy buffs in the City.

27

MR. GOLDSMITH: It's a history. I don't want that to --

THE COURT: I get the San Diego Union at home and I disclosed that I have read the newspaper just like any local judge would.

MR. GOLDSMITH: I understand.

2.3

And there will be a day, Your Honor, when the stock market goes down; I don't know what percentage, but at some point the stock market will go down and the City's contribution will go up and somebody will look at the City Charter and say, "Wait a second. Why did the City do this?"

I want there to be a clear public record as to the legitimate policy reason. We have a court reporter here. We will ask for a transcript. We will preserve it in the historical record of the City. Your tentative, our papers, these declarations are all geared to preserve the integrity of this agreement. It is in good faith. It is good policy made by the City Council in good faith.

The reason doesn't have to do with the stock market, it has to do with preserving our employees and keeping and retaining them. And at this point in time -- at this point in time in the City's history it is a huge problem, particularly with the Police Department, as your tentative pointed out, and so the City Council made a policy decision and they made it for good reasons at this time. And it is also a good thing. There are times when the stock market goes up and there are times when the

stock market goes down.

2.3

2.8

THE COURT: I have a 401k; I'm aware of that.

MR. GOLDSMITH: So do I.

And the City Council recognizes the risk of when it goes down and goes high. The City can absorb that. And we'll take that risk and we'll take the benefits when it goes up better than individual employees who would be scared of that risk and more apt to leave the City. The record supports that. Your tentative is correct. I just want the record for a decade later if and when that happens there is an explanation and it's all out in the public.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Goldsmith.

As set forth in the memorandum attached to my tentative which says -- tentatively grants the motion, I have no relation to Assistant Chief Shelley Zimmerman. We could be the only two people in an elevator car and we wouldn't know we were each named Zimmerman. And I don't mean to be offensive, I don't know if it is Shelley as in -- and I'm dating myself here -- as in Shelley Winters or as in it Shelley Berman, I don't know if it's a man or a woman. I'm not familiar with that person at all. But that declaration was rather persuasive to me.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

And that information was persuasive to the City Council.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Yes, sir.

2.6

2.8

MR. MCGRATH: Your Honor, Chris McGrath again for respondent SDCERS.

I think every party in the room is in accord with the ultimate relief sought by this motion, so we all seek it and we all appreciate the ultimate result of this is a good faith determination that we need to finalize the settlement.

The only minor factual modification that I would request, your tentative refers to the summary judgment motion reference in the first paragraph. In fact, the summary judgment motion the City brought was not eventually heard, it was withdrawn prior to hearing.

THE COURT: Oh, okay. Then that will stand corrected.

MR. MCGRATH: But with that modification we are obviously on board with seeking a good faith determination.

THE COURT: If I had the history down incorrectly, then I will --

Does anybody disagree with that?

MR. GOLDSMITH: No. That's a good catch.

Thank you. We agree. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I thank you, sir. I'll correct the memo on the tentative to the extent that you have indicated.

MR. MCGRATH: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You're welcome.

MS. SMITH: Your Honor, Ann Smith.

THE COURT: Yes.

2.8

MS. SMITH: In that regard, in that first paragraph I think what Your Honor was likely thinking is that Your Honor did hear and deny the City's motion for judgment on the pleadings.

THE COURT: Yeah, it was judgment on the pleadings, not summary judgment, that's true.

MS. SMITH: That's right. And then the City's summary judgment motion was pending but withdrawn before hearing, so if you want to correct that history, that would be the reference.

MS. SMITH: Thank you.

agreed to by the defendants and the intervenors but that they are without any admission that Proposition B is valid. The Court has to assume that Proposition B is valid. I understand your reasons for not wanting to agree to that, but I think the City Attorney's analogy is that that's like China not recognizing that Taiwan exists, it doesn't mean that Taiwan doesn't exist.

So I don't have any problem with the fact that you're, for whatever purposes -- and I know what purpose it is, really, I'm not oblivious to it, that you don't want to recognize the validity of that proposition, but still.

And before I make the final ruling, does anybody have anything else to add.

MS. SMITH: Your Honor, I would just add this one comment which is that we have agreed to proceed as the City has requested --

THE COURT: Yes.

2.3

2.6

2.8

MS. SMITH: -- in recognition that so long as Proposition B remains in the City's Charter, that this is the proper procedure to follow and that's why we're before you. So we have all agreed that we will comply with this procedure, but in so doing and because we do have a pending case on which at the first level the administrative law judge has agreed with us that Proposition B is not lawful, that we, obviously --

THE COURT: Well, I wasn't aware of that, but that's a different matter, that's not before me.

MS. SMITH: Right, exactly. In other words, this is not just an idle observation that we are making to be difficult. So we are putting aside the fact that we have pending litigation on the lawfulness of Proposition B and we are simply agreeing that in order to come to a conclusion here --

THE COURT: So you don't want to make any admissions that might be used against you in other pending litigation.

MS. SMITH: Exactly right. Exactly right. But we are all in agreement that we are proceeding in this manner and we are submitting to you the request that you

make this good faith determination.

2.8

THE COURT: All right.

MS. SMITH: And, as you know, there was no opposition to you doing so.

THE COURT: No, I noted that nobody has raised any issue of any bad faith here. And I'm of the view that if there's no bad faith, then that must equal good faith because I don't know what can be in the middle.

MS. SMITH: That's right.

THE COURT: So I'm inclined to go along with the tentative and make that ruling unless anybody has anything else to say. I want to make sure we have a perfect record here because this is an important case and I recognize that.

Officially, then, the Petitioner City of San Diego's motion for good faith settlement pursuant to Proposition B as opposed to the good faith settlement I'm used to under Code of Civil Procedure is granted.

Now is there -- does somebody have on order?

I would like the order circulated and signed by all parties.

MS. SMITH: Your Honor, the order that we prepared and submitted to you with our papers is a simple statement of your good faith determination.

I did revise it to strike out the word "proposed" and to allow for a signature on today's date.

I did bring that with me, if that would be convenient.

It is the same --

THE COURT: Yeah, we'll strike the word "proposed," if that's on there.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Your Honor, I don't have a problem with an order on the motion. I'd like to prepare the judgment. The Settlement Agreement has specific wording on what the judgment should state.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GOLDSMITH: It should incorporate the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.3

2.6

MR. GOLDSMITH: So I would like to prepare the judgment and circulate it.

The order could simply be -- an oral order would be acceptable to us from the bench that, as you have stated, is acceptable to us. We would waive a written order and just accept your oral bench order. If that's acceptable to all counsel, I don't have a problem with that, or simply an order granting the motion.

THE COURT: I'm an old dog and it's hard for me to learn new tricks. I'm used to signing an order afterwards. But is there any way that I can do that without driving 120 miles?

MS. SMITH: Your Honor, I do have the order ready for your signature. And I made extra copies so that there could be a conforming and we would then be able to distribute that amongst ourselves.

MR. GOLDSMITH: We don't have a problem with the proposed order, Your Honor. I would like to prepare

the judgment and circulate it.

2.3

2.8

Can we send it to you or send it to the court and make sure that you don't have to do the 120-mile trip --

THE COURT: Well, sometimes I come over here for other reasons. I'll do it as quick as I can, but I think the court will prepare the order.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Oh, okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: But as far as the judgment, I'll leave that up to you.

MR. GOLDSMITH: If it's okay, I will prepare the judgment and circulate it among counsel. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

I want to thank you, counsel. I think I mentioned this at the very beginning and, that is, when I agreed to accept this assignment, I didn't think that I would be here more than ten minutes.

The first thing I said was, "Are there any motions?" And I thought there'll be a 170.6, and there wasn't. But you have all been very courteous and very professional and I really appreciate that and I want to compliment you all for that.

MR. KLEVENS: Your Honor, may I inquire when we can expect the City will circulate this proposed judgment to counsel?

THE COURT: Yeah, it should be circulated. I want everybody to sign off on it before I sign off on it.

MR. GOLDSMITH: We can get it to you within a

week.

2.3

2.8

MS. SMITH: Your Honor, may I inquire?

The Settlement Agreement, which was of course fully executed and approved by all of the parties, requires that within five days of the Court's approval of this agreement as a good faith settlement, the City's petition shall be dismissed with prejudice, so may I inquire if that is going to occur based on your approval today of the settlement?

THE COURT: Let me ask the City what their position is on that because it's fine with me, but there may be some technical reason the City Attorney's Office doesn't want to go along with that.

MS. SMITH: They did sign off on it already, Your Honor, it has been approved, that is what you are approving today --

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. SMITH -- so I just want to make sure it's in force as written.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not reversing myself, so it's in force, yes.

MS. SMITH: Right. Okay.

MR. GOLDSMITH: There is also a provision in the Agreement having to do with the judgment. I'm happy -- we'll comply with the Settlement Agreement and try to get the proposed judgment out.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Today is Friday. We'll see if

we can get it out by the end of the day so we can comply.

THE COURT: All right. And if it can be somehow Express mailed or FedEx'd to me that will be wonderful. And I will do the same thing, I will send it back like a boomerang; it will be back so fast you won't know it.

MR. GOLDSMITH: We'll also meet and confer with counsel on how best to do it. Our goal is to get the case dismissed with prejudice and get the judgment complying with the Settlement Agreement.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GOLDSMITH: So we'll see what we can do.

THE COURT: You mentioned somewhere in these pleadings that everybody understands, and you are all seasoned attorneys and you are all good attorneys, that litigation is inherently uncertain, but the only thing certain about litigation is it's expensive and no matter what ruling the trial court made it's going to be appealed and that's going to take several years and enormous expense and I think you all saved a lot of money by settling this case where you each got something and it makes sense and I think you have been reasonable.

Anyway, thank you.

MS. SMITH: And, Your Honor, the only remaining business then I think before you, apart from what we will be doing in preparing, reviewing, and submitting a judgment and this dismissal will be entered, then we need to get a date from you, as you know, in May for the

hearing on the attorneys' fee motions which are also called out in our Settlement Agreement, and we were going to propose --

THE COURT: I can't breath easy yet.

MS. SMITH: We were going to propose to Your Honor, if a Friday is still your preference, that perhaps May 23rd or even May 30th, if that works for you.

THE COURT: I'm going on a vacation, a rather lengthy vacation in May.

MS. SMITH: I see. Okay. So is June better then or --

THE COURT: It would be.

MS. SMITH: All right.

2.3

THE COURT: Early June, I suppose, would be fine. Fridays or Mondays are really my preference, but that's just because it's more convenient, there's no real reason other than just my own personal convenience.

MS. SMITH: And that's fine, Your Honor. We can all manage on a Friday or Monday. We often, of course, have motion hearings in the court on Friday anyway, so that's fine, whatever your preference is.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Your Honor, if I could be heard on that?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. GOLDSMITH: If we could just schedule that the way we normally do in due course. I don't have a calendar here and we haven't received any motion papers yet.

THE COURT: No.

2.3

2.8

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ GOLDSMITH: I would like to go back to the judgment and dismissal so the Court and everyone knows what I was talking about.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Paragraph 15 of the Agreement says, "The parties agree that this Agreement is contingent upon the Court's entry of a good faith settlement determination and a judgment incorporating the terms and approving the agreement."

The next sentence says, "If this agreement is"

-- I'm sorry. It says, in 17, "Within five days of
the Court's approval of this Agreement as a good faith
settlement the City's petition shall be dismissed with
prejudice." So we have a judgment and we have a
dismissal and we have got to work that out; there is a
little inconsistency there is what I'm saying. It
envisions a judgment incorporating the terms of the
Settlement Agreement, but also a dismissal, so I think we
have to work that out.

As for the date of the hearing, can we defer that?

THE COURT: Yes, I agree.

MS. SMITH: Your Honor, may I? I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Please.

MS. SMITH: May I just say that we had conferred by email about setting the date in May for the attorneys' fee motions and agreed that we would ask you

to set that date. As Your Honor probably knows,

Ms. Sablan, the clerk in Presiding, had to endure three
weeks of multiple email exchanges just to get this
hearing set before you today, and I don't think we should
put the Court's staff through that again, so if we could
set the date. There is plenty of time.

We contemplated by email exchanges with Mr. Worley that we would have a date and then we would do the filings by code in relation to the hearing date, so I'd like to go out of here today with that hearing date.

THE COURT: Legally when is judgment actually entered: When I make my pronouncement or when I sign the document that says that's it? I think it's when I sign.

MR. CONGER: Your Honor, Mike Conger.

Technically, and I have been through this before many times, there can only be one judgment. And you remember from reading appellate cases there is the "one final judgment rule." The final judgment in this case will be the judgment of dismissal with prejudice.

Paragraph 15 is technically inaccurate. That should just be an order approving this settlement as opposed to a judgment. But there can only be one judgment. And so if you want to reconcile them, perhaps there should be a judgment saying: I approve the settlement in good faith. As set forth in my tentative, I approve of the Settlement Agreement and the case is hereby dismissed with prejudice and then it incorporates both.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Your Honor, I would like to be heard on that.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.3

2.8

MR. GOLDSMITH: If you are going to do away with a term in a settlement we need to talk and meet and confer on that and that might require a motion. But an important term of this Settlement Agreement was that there would be a judgment incorporating the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement so it's all of record, the Settlement Agreement would be attached, and that is the terms and conditions of the judgment, the case is dismissed, we all go away and that's of record.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. GOLDSMITH: But why don't we give a chance for the lawyers to deal with this and see if we can work it out.

THE COURT: I think I'm going to error on the side of caution here and go along with the City Attorneys' position on this. I don't want to act in haste and then regret it later. So I'll wait until we have a written judgment and then within five days of that there has to be a dismissal pursuant to the Agreement with prejudice.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. SMITH: And that's fine, Your Honor. And I would just request again that before all of these lawyers leave, that we simply get a date for the hearing on the attorneys' fee motion that is compatible with your

calendar so we do not have to go through and put your staff through what we did put the staff through to get this hearing today.

THE COURT: Just out of curiosity, does

Proposition B provide for attorneys' fees on litigation
or is this one of these benefits to the public?

MS. SMITH: It's a 1021.5 motion, Your Honor, or basis. This case doesn't arise under Proposition B in any event, that was never even put before you.

THE COURT: Well, okay. All right.

MS. SMITH: Yes. It is only because of this settlement feature under Prop B that we are doing this good faith process.

THE COURT: Well, I would tentatively like to set Friday, June 6th, if that's acceptable to everybody, if nobody is going to be in Bora Bora that day.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Your Honor, I'm not prepared with a calendar.

THE COURT: Well, we can change it. We changed the date on this hearing several times. I'm fluid on that.

MR. KLEVENS: Could I just suggest, as
Your Honor stated, have June 6th as the tentative date?
If the City Attorney comes forward and says that for some reason he's unable to make that date, then we'll have to deal with an alternative, but at least we'll have that date on calendar tentatively subject to the City Attorney having --

1 THE COURT: And the next date is Friday, the 2 13th, so --MS. SMITH: And on Friday, June 6th, 3 Your Honor, what is your preference for a time for the 4 5 hearing? THE COURT: I like the 10:00 a.m. time --6 7 MS. SMITH: All right. THE COURT: -- if that's good with everybody. 8 9 It gives me more time, gives you more time. 10 I don't suppose there is any hope here, but can you talk about this and see if there is any way that you 11 12 can resolve this informally before June 6th? 13 MR. GOLDSMITH: There is no basis for either 14 side recovering attorneys' fees, this is a settlement; 15 but if they want to try and roll the dice, so be it. 16 It's a settlement. 17 Yeah, there you go. THE COURT: 18 MR. GOLDSMITH: That's what it's about. 19 THE COURT: I tentatively believe that you each 20 got something out of the settlement, which is a good 21 thing. 22 Okay, June 6th at 10:00 a.m., the department to 23 be assigned. 24 MR. GOLDSMITH: Okay. 25 THE COURT: I appreciate your help, counsel. 26 Thank you. 27 Your Honor, just as administrative, MR. CHUNG: 28 to get you the proposed judgment when all of the counsel

have signed off, previously you provided counsel your email address. In lieu of overnight, would you like us to email it to you?

2.8

THE COURT: Yeah, I guess I can print it out and sign it because you're going to have to have an actual what they call, I guess, "wet signature" on the document. And then I'll get it in the overnight mail or Federal Express or something back to the Court.

Does that satisfy you, Mr. Chung?

MR. CHUNG: That is just to help you out. And if for some reason the email copy doesn't work, obviously one of the parties will overnight it to you.

THE COURT: If it comes down to it -- you see,
I didn't have any problems before, I lived here, I had a
house in San Diego, but I sold it last month and now I
don't have a base of operations here that I can live in
my own house. And I hate living out of a hotel room; I
don't suppose anybody likes that. So I'll come over here
if I have to, but if I can avoid it, I would like to
avoid it. And it costs the State less money if we can
avoid it.

You know, I have noticed good attorneys either make a judge's life hell or they make it easy, and you have done everything that you can to make it easy rather than make it hell. Thank you.

MR. GOLDSMITH: Let's see if we can handle the judgment without that.

MR. CHUNG: Thank you, Your Honor.

1	MR. MCGRATH: Thank you, Your Honor.
2	MS. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.
3	THE CLERK: Your Honor, notice waived on the
4	hearing?
5	THE COURT: Oh, yeah, the clerk has a good
6	idea. Is notice waived as far as written notice of the
7	June 6th?
8	MR. CHUNG: The City waives notice.
9	(Affirmative response from all counsel in
10	unison.)
11	MR. KLEVENS: We would just request
12	THE COURT: Is there anyone who is not waiving
13	notice?
14	(No response.)
15	MR. KLEVENS: that if the City Attorney
16	wants to change that date, if he would let us know as
17	soon as he gets back to his office.
18	THE COURT: Yeah.
19	MS. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.
20	
21	(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED)
22	0000
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

CERTIFICATE

State	of	Cali:	fornia	,
County	of	San	Diego	,

I, Lois Mason Thompson, CSR No. 3685, a reporter in the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of San Diego, hereby certify that I reported in machine shorthand the proceedings had in the above-entitled cause, and that the foregoing transcript is a full, true, and correct transcript of the said proceedings.

Dated at San Diego, California, February 23, 2014.

Lois Mason Thompson CSR No. 3685

Government Code Section 69954(D): Any court, party, or person who has purchased a transcript may, without paying a further fee to the reporter, reproduce a copy or portion thereof as an exhibit pursuant to court order or rule, or for internal use, but shall not otherwise provide or sell a copy or copies to any other party or person.